

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
Chapter 1		
1.1	Barriers in periodontal therapy	2
1.2	Distinct features of Periodontic gum and healthy gum (Yadav <i>et al.</i> , 2015).	3
Chapter 2		
2.1	The anatomical structure of tooth (obtained from intranet.tdmu.edu.ua).	10
2.2	The symptoms associated with progression of periodontal disease from healthy gingiva to advanced periodontitis (modified from Alliance Dental Center)(Bermudez and Grau, 2011; Center, 2017).	12
2.3	Illustration of pathogenesis and progression of periodontitis and various treatment strategies, SRP- Scaling and Root Planning (Yadav <i>et al.</i> , 2015).	16
2.4	Representation of diseases with oral-systemic connections with periodontitis	17
2.5	Current treatment strategies for the treatment of periodontitis (modified from Yadav <i>et al.</i> , 2015).	20
2.6	Hierarchy of advances in periodontal drug delivery (Yadav <i>et al.</i> , 2015)	22
2.7	Mechanism of sol-gel transformation	34
2.8	2D and 3D structures of ornidazole (Yadav and Mishra, 2016)	41
2.9	2D and 3D structures of Doxycycline	44
2.10	Structure of chitosan	47
2.11	Structure of sodium alginate	49
2.12	General structure of pluronics. Pluronic F127: a= 200.45,	52

b=65.17 and Pluronic F68: a= 152.73, b=80.97

2.13	Structure of sodium tripolyphosphate	56
2.14	Structure of glutaraldehyde	58
2.15	Structure of vanillin	60

CHAPTER 3

3.1	Schematic presentation of plan of work	63
------------	--	----

CHAPTER 4

4.1	Zero order UV spectra; a) Ornidazole b) Doxycycline hyclate.	71
4.2	Overlay spectra of OZ and DX illustrating λ_{max} of both the drugs and their iso-absorptive point.	73
4.3	FTIR spectra of ornidazole (OZ), doxycycline hyclate (DX), and physical mixture (OZ+DX).	77
4.4	Zero order UV spectra; (a) OZ; (b) DX; (c) overlay spectra of OZ and DX. The spectra of mixed drug solutions OZ:DX as (d) 1:1 (black), 2:1 (green), and red (3:1); (e) 1:1 (blue), 1:2 (green), 1:3 (violet).	78
4.5	Calibration curve of OZ at 319, 274 and 292 nm.	79
4.6	Calibration curve of DX at 319, 274 and 292 nm.	79

CHAPTER 5

5.1	Schematic representation of w/o emulsion crosslinking method for the formulation of chitosan-alginate (CS-Ca-SA) polyelectrolyte complexed microspheres.	89
5.2	Diagrammatic illustration of ionic-gelation crosslinking (Method A) and w/o emulsion crosslinking method (Method B) for preparation of microspheres. ① Dissolution of drugs and polymers in respective solvents (Method A and B); ② Mixing of drug solution and polymer (Method A and B); ③ Dropping of drug-polymer solution to liquid paraffin (Method B); ④ Formation of stable w/o emulsion (Method B); ⑤ Dropping of crosslinking agent to solidify the formed aqueous droplets in w/o emulsion with the help of syringe (Method B); ⑥ Addition of crosslinking agent directly to the drug-polymer solution (Method	98

	A); ⑦ Filtration and washing (Method A and B); ⑧ Drying and collection of microspheres (Method A and B).	
5.3	Diagrammatic and optical microscopic illustration of steps involved in the formation of chitosan crosslinked microspheres.	103
5.4	Demonstration of Pareto plots for the selection of critical formulation variables having significant effect on desired dependent response variables.	112
5.5	2D Contour and 3D surface plots describing most influencing variables on particle size (PS), entrapment efficiency (EE), burst release (BOZ and BDX) and time for 80% cumulative drug release ($T_{80\%}$).	113
5.6	<i>In-vitro</i> release of OZ and DX from optimized CS-Ca-SA microspheres in PBS pH 6.8 using dialysis method. Inset showing the burst release profile within 12 h. Vertical bars indicate SD (n=3).	118
5.7	SEM images of (a) OZ powder; (b) DX powder; (c, d, e) CS-Ca-SA microspheres and (f) surface view of microsphere.	120
5.8	EDXA spectra showing elemental composition of CS-Ca-SA microspheres	120
5.9	FTIR spectra of OZ, DX, CS, SA, physical mixture and CS-Ca-SA microspheres.	122
5.10	Overlay spectrum DSC graphs of OZ, DX, SA, CS, physical mixture and CS-Ca-SA microspheres.	123
5.11	XRD pattern of OZ, DX, CS, SA, physical mixture and microspheres.	124
5.12	Comparative (a) swelling curve and (b) erosion curve of optimized batches of Ca-SA and CS-Ca-SA microspheres in simulated saliva pH 6.8. Vertical bars corresponds to SD (n=3).	125
5.13	Antimicrobial activity of CS-Ca-SA microspheres against <i>S. aureus</i> and <i>E. coli</i> . Vertical bars represent SD, n=3. All groups showed significant ($p<0.001$) zone of inhibition as compared to control (0h) by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests.	127
5.14	(a) Percent cell viabilities of microspheres samples, A	129

	(0.01g/ml), B (0.05g/ml) and C (0.1g/ml) prepared by incubating in DMEM media for 120 h against L929 cell lines. Untreated DMEM media was evaluated as control. Vertical bars represent SEM (n=6). All groups are compared with control two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests.; (b) Incubation time vs. IC ₅₀ plot; (c) fluorescent microscopic images showing cytocompatibility of various microspheres samples (A, B, C and control (C1)) with L929 cell lines stained with FDA and EDB.	
5.15	Shelf-life plots of optimised batch of microspheres at different storage conditions viz. Refrigeration, Room temperature, High temperature. LS - lower specification (set at 90%).	130
5.16	Optical microscopic images demonstrating process of formulation of microspheres. Method A- a) immediate gelation of CS-TPP particles, which appear weak and in variable sizes; b) solidification of particles; c) solidified microspheres; d) dried microspheres: Method B- e) formed w/o emulsion; f) solidification of aqueous chitosan droplets after addition of TPP, the solidified particles surrounded by surfactants bubbles; g) solidified microspheres; h) dried microspheres.	132
5.17	Pareto charts for process yield (PY), particle size (PS), entrapment efficiency (EEOZ and EEDX), burst release (BOZ and BDX) and time for 80% drug release (TOZ and TDX) indicating most influencing variables	136
5.18	Contour and surface plots depicting the effect of independent variables on responses: particle size (PS) and entrapment efficiency (EEOZ and EEDX).	137
5.19	Contour and surface plots displaying the effect of independent variables on responses: burst release (BOZ and BDX) and time for 80 % drug release (TOZ and TDX).	137
5.20	<i>In-vitro</i> drugs release profiles of optimized microspheres in phosphate buffer pH 6.8. Inset showing burst release pattern (Vertical bars represent SD, n=3).	141
5.21	Swelling (% swelling vs. time curve) and erosion (% drug remaining vs. time) curve for microspheres. Vertical bars are SD.	143
5.22	a) Method A, oven-dried - mixture of spherical, and irregularly shaped aggregated particles; b) Method B, oven-dried - less spherical and non-aggregated; c) Method A, freeze-dried -	144

	spherical and less aggregated; d) Method B, freeze-dried - spherical and non-aggregated.	
5.23	FTIR spectra of OZ, DX, CS, TPP, physical mixture and microspheres.	145
5.24	DSC thermograms of OZ, DX, CS, TPP and microspheres.	146
5.25	XRD patterns of OZ, DX, CS, tripolyphosphate, physical mixture and CSTPP microspheres.	147
5.26	(a) Percent cell viabilities of different concentrations of microspheres A (0.01g/ml), B (0.05g/ml) and C (0.1g/ml), incubated in DMEM for 96 h against L929 cell lines. All groups showed non-significant differences in cell viability as compared to control by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests. Vertical bars represent SEM (n=6); (b) Incubation time vs. IC50 plot; Untreated DMEM media was evaluated as control; (c) Fluorescent microscopic images showing cytocompatibility of various microspheres samples (control, A, B, and C) with L929 cell lines.	148
5.27	(a and b) Antimicrobial activity of <i>In-vitro</i> drug release samples at various time interval against <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (A and B) and <i>Escherichia coli</i> (C and D). Vertical bars represent SD, n=3. All groups showed significant (p<0.001) zone of inhibition as compared to control (0 h) by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests.	149
5.28	Shelf-life plots for CSTPP microspheres at different storage conditions.	150
5.29	Pareto charts representing the effect of formulation variables on responses. The variables beyond reference line (dotted line) are considered significantly important.	153
5.30	Graphs displaying 2D contour and 3D surface plots. The plots show the effect of significant variables on desirable responses.	154
5.31	Comparative (a) <i>In-vitro</i> doxycycline hyclate release and (b) <i>In-vitro</i> swelling of optimized CSV and CSG microspheres. Vertical bars represent SD.	157
5.32	¹ H NMR of chitosan, vanillin and placebo chitosan-vanillin microspheres	159

5.33	Infrared spectra and (b) X-ray Diffraction graphs of DX, CS, CSG microspheres and CSV microspheres.	160
5.34	SEM images; (a) Cluster and (b) single CSV microspheres ;(c) bunch and (d) single CSG microspheres.	162
5.35	EDXA spectra showing elemental composition of optimised CSV microspheres	162
5.36	Comparative cytocompatibility studies of CSV and CSG microspheres and IC ₅₀ values calculation. All groups showed non-significant differences in cell viability as compared to control by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests. Vertical bars represent SEM (n=6).	165
5.37	Antimicrobial activity of optimised CSV microspheres against E coli and S aureus. Vertical bars represent SD, n=3. All groups showed significant (p<0.001) zone of inhibition as compared to control (0 h) by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests.	166
5.38	(a and b) Stability studies and shelf-life of optimized CSV microspheres. Vertical bars in (a) represent SD.	167
5.39	2D surface plots illustrating the effect of independent variables on responses associated with chitosan-VAN microspheres.	171
5.40	3D surface plots illustrating the effect of independent variables on responses associated with chitosan-VAN microspheres.	171

CHAPTER 6

6.1	Diagrammatic and optical microscopic illustration (a, b, c, d and e) of steps involved in the formation of crosslinked microspheres loaded in-situ gels (MLIG).	176
6.2	Laboratory setup of modified physical balance for mucoadhesion studies	179
6.3	(a) Diagrammatic and (b) Pictorial representation of mechanism 'sol' state to 'gel' state transformation of formulated thermosensitive gels.	186
6.4	2D contour and 3D surface plots illustrating the effect of independent variables on responses associated with MLIG.	188

6.5	<i>In-vitro</i> drug release studies of OZ and DX from optimized microspheres and MLIG. Vertical bars represent SD.	190
6.6	Scanning electron microscopic view of microspheres (a-f), placebo gels (g) and microspheres loaded in-situ gels (MLIG) (h and i). Swollen microspheres during at the end of first day of release study (d), degraded microspheres after release period of 12 days (e and f).	192
6.7	Infrared spectra of (a) OZ, DX, VAN, CS, their physical mixture and microspheres; (b), P127407, P68, CP934, their physical mixture, VAN, and MLIG	193
6.8	DSC spectra of (a) DX, OZ, VAN, CS, PM1 (physical mixture of DX, OZ, VAN, CS at 1:1:1:1) and microspheres, (b) P127, P68, CP934, PM2 (physical mixture of P127, P68, CP934 and microspheres at 1:1:1:1) and MLIG.	194
6.9	XRD patterns of (a) DX, OZ, DX, VAN, CS, PM1 (physical mixture of DX, OZ, VAN, CS at 1:1:1:1) and drug loaded microspheres, (b) P127, P68, CP934, PM2 (physical mixture of P127, P68, CP934 and drug loaded microspheres at 1:1:1:1) and MLIG.	195
6.10	Rheology of gels. Viscosity measurements at 25° C.	197
6.11	Swelling and erosion studies of MLIG in simulated saliva pH 6.8.	198
6.12	Shelf-life plots of optimized MLIG formulations. (a) Shelf-life plot as per DX concentration. (b) Shelf-life as per OZ concentration after storage.	200
6.13	Antimicrobial activity of microspheres (drug release samples after 1 day (M1) and 12 days (M12)), Placebo gel and MLIG formulations. Vertical bars represent SEM. ***p < 0.001 as compared to placebo gel, ^{ns} p > 0.05 - non-significant as compared to positive control.	200
6.14	Histopathological images of subcutaneous tissue of rats injected with MLIG at 40X magnification. (a) Non-stained MLIG formulations (green arrow) surrounded by macrophages (red arrow) at day 1. (b) 1st week (c) 2nd week (d) 3rd week (e) 4th week- inflammatory cells almost disappeared and no significant inflammatory cells were observed and (f) Control.	202
6.15	(a) graded response for tooth motility, gingival index, continuity	204

of epithelium and transseptal fibers were noted in group I (Control), Group II (Periodontal rats) and Group III (Treated rats) after 2 weeks. $**p < 0.01$ and $***p < 0.001$ compared to group I (Control), ns - non-significant as compared to control by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests. Vertical bars represents SEM, n = 6. (b, c, d and e) Microscopic observations of differentiation of gingival connective tissue (gct), dentine (dt), pre-dentine (pd), pulp (pl) and alveolar bone (ab) of rats after LIP (10 X). (b) Group I; (c) Group II; Group III (d) After 1 week of treatment; and (e) after 2 weeks of treatment. (f and g) High magnification images (40 X), (f) showing damaged 'gct' and inflammatory response in periodontal rats. Monocyte (mc) infiltration (red arrow) and damaged periodontal ligaments (lg) (blue arrow) in the 'gct' as a result of ligature placement, the cells were stained blue containing condensed nuclei and little cytoplasm. Also, some motile, large and multinucleate osteoclasts 'oc' cells (yellow arrow) can be observed near bone resorption area viz. alveolar bone (ab), and (g) regenerated ligaments (lg) after 2 weeks of treatment period.

- 6.16** Photographs of (a) Pocket depth measurement; (b) Injection of placebo gels; and (c) Injection of MLIG formulations. 205
- 6.17** Graphs showing measurement of clinical parameters; (a) PI, (b) GI, (c) BOP. Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$ and $***p < 0.001$ compared to group I, $\$p < 0.05$, $\$\$p < 0.01$ and $\$\$\$p < 0.001$, as compared to group II by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests. 206
- 6.18** Graphs showing measurement of clinical parameters; (a) PPD and (b) CAL. $*p < 0.05$ and $**p < 0.01$ compared to group I, $\$p < 0.05$ as compared to group II by two-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-tests. Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10. 206
-

